

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This is intended to be a complete response to the Official Action mailed June 15, 2006, in which claims 6-14, 17, 18 and 21-23 were rejected and claim 15 was withdrawn. Claims 6-15 and 21-23 have been cancelled herein without prejudice in order to advance prosecution of the application. Claims 17 and 18 have been amended. New claims 24-26 have been added.

Objections to the claims

Claims 6-14 and 18 have been objected to as being still partially directed to non-elected inventions (i.e., SEQ ID NO: 4, 6, 8).

Claims 6-14 have been cancelled in order to advance prosecution of the case and claim 18 has been amended to be directed to SEQ ID NO: 2.

In view of the above, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 6-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 6 and 7 have been cancelled without prejudice, thereby mooting the rejection. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2

Claims 6-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, in that claim 6 (and claims 7-14 dependent thereon) is indefinite in the recitation of "(C) a polynucleotide which differs . . . from the isolated polynucleotides of (A)" in view of the fact that there is no antecedent basis for "the isolated polynucleotides of A".

Claims 6-14 have been cancelled without prejudice, thereby mooting the rejection. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 1

Claims 6-14, 17-18, 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement, in that the claim(s) contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 6-14 and 21-23 have been cancelled without prejudice in order to advance prosecution of the application.

Claims 17 and 18 have been amended to be directed to an expression system comprising a recombinant host cell comprising a first expressible

polynucleotide which encodes a code 1 β 3-galactosyl transferase and a second expressible polynucleotide which encodes a core 1 β 3-galactosyl transferase specific molecular chaperone wherein the second expressible polynucleotide comprises:

"(A) a polynucleotide having the SEQ ID No.: 2; (B) a polynucleotide which hybridizes with the polynucleotide having SEQ ID No: 2 under stringency conditions comprising prehybridization and hybridization at 68°C followed by washing twice with two x SSC, 0.1% SDS at 22°C, and washing twice with 0.2 x SSC, 0.1% SDS at 22°C; or prehybridization and hybridization at 42°C in 5 x SSPE, 0.3% SDS, 200 ug/ml sheared and denatured salmon sperm DNA, and 25% formamide, or 35% formamide, or 50% formamide, and washing with 2 x SSC, 0.2% SDS at 50°C;(C) a polynucleotide which differs in nucleotide sequence from the polynucleotide of (A) due to degeneracy of the genetic code and which encodes a protein having core 1 β 3 galactosyl transferase specific molecular chaperone activity; or (D) a polynucleotide which differs in nucleotide sequence from the polynucleotides of (A), (B) or (C) in that said polynucleotide lacks a nucleotide sequence which encodes a transmembrane domain wherein the encoded core 1 β 3 galactosyl transferase specific molecular chaperone is soluble."

In view of the above, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 1.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 6-10, 13-14, 21, 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Chen et al. (WO 00/15796 published on March 23, 2000).

Claims 6-10, 13-14, 21 and 23 have been cancelled without prejudice, in order to advance prosecution of the application, thereby mooted the rejection. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Specification

In the specification, the paragraph beginning at paragraph 0049 has been amended to correct minor editorial problems.

Conclusion

In view of the above, applicants respectfully submit the claims are now in a condition for allowance and respectfully issuance of a Notice of Allowance therefor.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher W. Corbett, Ph.D.,
Reg. No. 36,109
DUNLAP CODDING & ROGERS, P.C.
P.O. Box 16370
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73113
Telephone: 405/607-8600
Facsimile: 405/607-8686
Agent for Applicants